

Date: Wed, 5 Oct 94 04:30:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #477  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 5 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 477

Today's Topics:

Even more interesting (was Re: Interes  
Glass houses and those who live in them  
Help Wanted: ARRL Candidate Questionnaire  
Is this a Part 97 violation?  
Newsgroup Suggestion  
Operation in Bahama's w/US license?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 03 Oct 1994 19:37:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)  
Subject: Even more interesting (was Re: Interes

mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva) writes:

>It really wasn't my intention to repeat this argument, but I guess I will,  
>in abridged form. It's \*not\* the electronics experts I'm thinking of. To  
>them I say have fun and let us know what you come up with. It's the \*beginners\*,  
>the vast bottom of the pyramid, who I'm talking about. You can repeat day  
>and night that other rigs are as easy to build, but what matters is what  
>beginners \*are\* doing, not what you say they could or should be doing. As  
>far as providing an incentive to build, who has ever suggested that? What  
>I have said is that knowing the code allows someone who \*has\* an itch to try  
>and put something together to start with something that a beginner should be  
>able to get working, rather than something that is likely \*not\* to work (again,  
>based on \*asking\* and \*listening\* for over twenty years, not "shoulda/coulda").

Ok, I AM a beginner. Before I got my license I had enough knowlege of electronics to tell you there is an Ohms Law (I could not tell you what it WAS just that it existed). I learned it for the test, learned about resistors, caps, coils, etc. I have absolutly NO, zero. interest in building a CW only home brew. I have built a kit for VHF DFing transmitters (because foxhunting interests me). I have done work repairing repeaters (because maintining repeaters interests me). I am working on a VHF low band Mocom 70 (because getting on 6 meters interests me).

If I ever get on HF, it will be with a KenYeaCom(tm) radio, not a home brew. When I move to 900, it will be on a converted 800 radio. My prefered UHF radio is a Motorola Biz Band (Right now a Motrax). My prefered VHF is a Syntor (anyone got one for sale?). I LIKE commercial radios. I like learning about them. It is something that motivates me to learn electronics.

The point is that people will use what interests them. Requireing me, or any of a number of hams I know, to do high speed morse will not create any more interest in electronics. Allowing some access to a majority of HF without the high speed morse will allow the 'repair oriented' hams to have access to world wide person to person communications. Keeping the requirement for the 13/20 WPM tests does nothing to further learning electronics. If someone is interested in talking to a 13 WPM station they will develop 13 WPM morse (or just flip a switch on their computer). Requireing it in todays world is, IMHO, little more than hazing.

>BTW, I agree, and have said before, that 5 wpm \*does\* meet this goal. I'd be >happy to award a General to anyone passing 5wpm and all the writtens, if I were >king (IIWK -- is that a recognized Net-ism?)

: -)

I realize that some of my points were made in a mannor to be clear if Jeff ((NH6IL) jumped in. Sorry if you took it personally, it was not intended to missquote you or misunderstand you.

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword, because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----

Date: Mon, 03 Oct 1994 20:02:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)  
Subject: Glass houses and those who live in them

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>In article <199410012203.PAA14529@ucsd.edu>

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM writes:

>

>>maybe jeff can down convert the LO from one of those TV sets through a divider

>>so he'd get low power and variable frequency...and yet another article...

>

>Actually, very few QRP'ers are running crystal control today.

>

>Sitting on the bench is the latest project: A 40M CW VFO'd QRP

>transmitter; the variable capacitor came from the UHF tuner of

>an old TV set (about 20 pF); in fact almost all the parts came

>from a TV, except for the handwound inductors, and the MPF-102

>FET's (Radio Shack).

>

>A fine example of a commercial QRP transceiver was the Heathkit

>HW-9; but today even better kits are being produced by QRP clubs

>around the country.

>

>Those of you who are run QRO, on your next QSO try turning

>down your output power a little at a time; I bet you'll be able

>to reduce it by 50% and still get a good signal report from the

>other fellow.

I usually run 450 milliwatts, the radio will not go any lower! If I have to I can go to over a hundred. (As for my commercial gear, one size fits all.)

>Remember that the regulations \*require\* that we run as little

>power as possible!

Actually it requires "the minimum transmitter power necessary to carry out the desired communications." It most certinally does NOT say "as little power as possible!" They are very different, Jeff.

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword, because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 1994 17:31:30 -0400 (EDT)

From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access4.digex.net>

Subject: Help Wanted: ARRL Candidate Questionnaire

There are some of us who are putting a questionnaire together for completion by the candidates for ARRL Roanoke Division Director and Division Vice Director. The results will be posted here and published elsewhere.

Our intent is to find where the candidates stand so we can be informed voters and make them account for their actions if they backpedal on their stated positions after being elected. We would therefore appreciate your input as to what you think should be asked.

Please, leave out the ARRL bashing and smart alecky responses. We're trying to be constructive and get people in League offices who will best represent our views.

After we get the questionnaire drafted and you'd like a copy to send to your candidates, just send me an e-mail and let me know.

73!

Tony Stalls, K4KY0

-----  
Date: 3 Oct 1994 22:36:38 GMT  
From: steview@sheridan.ncd.com (Steve Wilson)  
Subject: Is this a Part 97 violation?

In article <36i3sa\$gdg@scratchy.reed.edu>, jfilner@reed.edu (jfilner) writes:

|> I've got a question I think I know the answer to, but figured I  
|> might as well ask. Figured this would at least be a short break from  
|> the code wars.

|> I work at a nuclear reactor (makes me more radioactive than the  
|> average ham :-)) ). I'm on the emergency response list, and so carry a  
|> pager. Sometimes when it goes off I'm not all that near a phone, so  
|> I'd like to be able to use the local autopatch to call in and find out  
|> what is wrong. My question is can this be construed as a prohibited

|> bussiness use under part 97? My feeling is that it might be okay  
|> because its a response to an emergency. Also I work for a nonprofit  
|> agency (A College), which may or not make it a bussiness under part 97.  
|> At the same time I feel the above arguments may not be all that  
|> solid, and someone will surely say just buy a cellular phone.  
|> I'd also like to say I haven't tried this yet, so no flames about  
|> that. Also this is a small reactor (yes there is such a thing ) and so  
|> for the most part we're not talking about life and death situtations.

This is obviously a personnel opinion, not someone speaking with the  
authority of God(or the his nearest representative, the FCC ;-). I don't  
think this would be acceptable because this is within the realm of your  
duties as an employee and consequently, isn't allowed under even the  
new rewrite of 97.113.

Any other takers?

Steve KA6S

-----  
Date: Mon, 03 Oct 1994 20:11:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)  
Subject: Newsgroup Suggestion

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>.misc receives almost 100 articles daily; .policy gets maybe  
>25 per day; even fewer if Dan and I go on vacation!

Not a chance Pal..... ;-)

>Jeff N Hawaii 6IL

Dan N8PKV

--  
"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword,  
because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force  
superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----  
Date: 3 Oct 1994 21:51:48 GMT  
From: dbarton@emoryu1.cc.emory.edu ( )  
Subject: Operation in Bahama's w/US license?

I will be travelling in the Bahama's and/or Carribean in December and am  
wondering about the rules relating to VHF and HF operation in the ham

bands within the areas controlled by these countries, and in International waters. I currently hold a Tech- license, and will soon be upgrading to General or maybe Advanced (depending on how much study time I have :-). All help is greatly appreciated...

Doug  
KE6LZM

-----  
Date: Mon, 3 Oct 94 19:26:12 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<CwMD3t.DpJ@news.hawaii.edu> <3644es\$9ed@nova.np.ac.sg>,  
<36pdgk\$qqf@apple.com>  
Subject: Re: Singapore's Ham Laws (or: we've got it easy in the US)

Kok Chen <kchen@apple.com> writes:

>I had to wait until I came to the Land of the Free, Home of the Brave, to  
>get a license. Even the U.S. was quite restrictive when I arrived on these  
>shores in the mid-60s - U.S. citizens only.

Actually that was the original reason that the U.S. started regulating radio and requiring station and operator licenses. It seems that Telefunken set up a point-to-point station on the East Coast to provide a telegraph link to Germany, shortly before World War I, and made the grievous tactical error of putting a big sign there with their name on it; Congress decided that foreign-owned stations like that were a threat to the neutrality we tried to maintain in those days, so they passed the first licensing laws and excluded aliens from holding those licenses. This provision is still in effect in many services to this day, though it's been relaxed for hams and (apparently) also doesn't prevent foreign-owned businesses from having two-way radio systems in their facilities.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

-----  
Date: Mon, 03 Oct 1994 19:55:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)

References<pYw0Q3T.edellers@delphi.com> <1994Sep30.171740.8433@clark.dgim.doc.ca>,  
<Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject: Re: Get Over It

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>jcumming@dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings) writes:

>

>>Then why is CW prevelant only on HF and not on VHF and above?

>

>CW is an excellent mode for working DX; not too much DX up there.

>

>CW transmitters are dead easy to build for HF; one needs to be a  
>magician to build something for V/UHF and have it actually work.

Not really Jeff. Just try it.

>Thus, we're at the mercy of what the manufacturers provide for us;  
>all mode xcvrs have a healthy price compared to an FM HT.

HINT: All mode xcvrs do more and are more complicated than mono modes.

>CW has historically been more prevelent on HF than on V/UHF; maybe  
>this is because the HF bands were first occupied with CW - other  
>modes and other bands came later. Thus, CW on HF became the norm.

So because they started in the stone age they should stay there? Not a  
very good arguement Jeff.

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword,  
because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force  
superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----

Date: Mon, 03 Oct 1994 19:53:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)

References<1994Sep29.162714.330@clark.dgim.doc.ca> <Cwynvq.Ezx@cruzio.com>,  
<36jo4b\$ptt@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Get Over It

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>Unfortunately, one of the problems with the codeless tech license was that  
>there is no upgrade path, period, unless you want to go on HF, then its code.  
>You have access to everything above 30mhz. You have the most bandwidth for  
>the smallest amount of rote memorization.

No, for passing the required tests. You have not demonstrated any proof of  
rote memorization being used by the majority of Technicians.

Dan

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword, because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----

Date: Mon, 03 Oct 1994 17:44:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)

References<CwszG9.80E@news.Hawaii.Edu> <36bs5p\$39g@news.iastate.edu>,  
<Cx2BMq.A96@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject: Re: Even more interesting (was Re: Interesting data)

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>In my experience as a government/military radio operator I encountered  
>very few operators who were also hams. This idea that you have of  
>the amateur service providing a trained pool of ops for \*outside\*  
>the amateur service just does not occure. Our trained pool goes to  
>work on the \*ham bands\* during times of natural disasters. The  
>only exception I can think of was the conscription of hams during  
>WWII.

Jeff, you make a claim that the ARS is not to provide a pool of trained operators, then you point out an example of grave national emergency where the trained pool WAS called upon. The trained pool is to provide a service to the nation in any manner that the nation needs. Time of war is definatly one. Some people think that, with the new wonder weapons, militia type training is not needed. The truth is that there may still be situations where the nation will call upon the militia and the hams for service to the nation. And as you yourself pointed out it has not been that long ago that we were needed outside the ARS.

>Some military ops do become hams (the ham license is easy after  
>the training they've received from the military), but the opposite  
>is rare.

That is not the point. The point is to have a pool ready when the situation arises, to provide any service that may be needed. If the ARS frequencies are sufficent (most of the time) then that is all tha is used. If those systems are not appropriate, then the 'operators' move to the areas that are (like WWII).

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword,



because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----

Date: Mon, 03 Oct 1994 19:58:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)

References<1994Sep30.171740.8433@clark.dgim.doc.ca> <Cx1KA3.wo@news.hawaii.edu>,  
<36mmmc\$ejq@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Subject: Re: Get Over It

mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>In article <Cx1KA3.wo@news.hawaii.edu>,  
>Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:  
>>jcumming@dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings) writes:  
>>  
>>>Then why is CW prevelant only on HF and not on VHF and above?  
>>  
>>CW is an excellent mode for working DX; not too much DX up there.  
>  
>Hummmm....I've worked CW transcontinental on VHF and above...via OSCAR 11.

Since you are admittedly not a ham you have no business working any amateur station. If you continue to admit to wrong doing on a public forum you might find the FCC take will take offense.

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword, because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----

Date: 4 Oct 1994 17:08:31 +1000  
From: dave@eram.esi.com.au (Dave Horsfall)

References<Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu> <36mtnd\$iqs@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>,  
<Cx29r1.9M1@news.hawaii.edu>  
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <Cx29r1.9M1@news.hawaii.edu>,  
jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

| BTW, do the British have a 75 MHz/4 meter band? A British newsletter  
| over on .misc implied that they do.

Yes. And Jeff - fix your return address, will you?

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) | dave@esi.com.au | VK2KFU @ VK2AAB.NSW.AUS.OC | PGP 2.6  
Opinions expressed are mine. | E7 FE 97 88 E5 02 3C AE 9C 8C 54 5B 9A D4 A0 CD

-----

Date: 4 Oct 1994 12:39:25 GMT  
From: md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan)

References<Cwynvq.Ezx@cruzio.com> <36jo4b\$ptt@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,  
<100394195345Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>  
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <100394195345Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

|> No, for passing the required tests. You have not demonstrated any proof of  
|> rote memorization being used by the majority of Technicians.

Are you now claiming that a majority of the technical exam is not  
rote memorization. Sorry, I didn't realize that there was much theoretical  
application to memorizing band limits, dipole construction formulas,  
yagi element length formulas, etc.

MD

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #477  
\*\*\*\*\*